





APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/435,562	11/08/1999	ERIK J. VAN DER BURG	MVMDINC.001C	5387
20995	7590 09/05/2003			
KNOBBE MARTENS OLSON & BEAR LLP			EXAMINER	
2040 MAIN STREET FOURTEENTH FLOOR			DAWSON, GLENN K	
IRVINE, CA	92014		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3761	
			DATE MAILED: 09/05/2003	
				18

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			4
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	7
	09/435,562	VAN DER BURG ET AL.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Glenn K Dawson	3761	
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence address	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, - Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). Status	16(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) day fill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>02 J</u>	uly 2003 .		
·_ ·	s action is non-final.		
3) Since this application is in condition for allowa closed in accordance with the practice under the			
Disposition of Claims			
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>38-45,51-98 and 101-128</u> is/are pend			
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw	vn from consideration.		
5)⊠ Claim(s) <u>51-58,61-77 and 80-98</u> is/are allowed.			
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>38-45,59,60,78,79,101-105 and 107-1</u>	<u>/28</u> is/are rejected.		
7)⊠ Claim(s) <u>106</u> is/are objected to.			
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	election requirement.		
Application Papers			
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner			
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accep			
Applicant may not request that any objection to the			
11) The proposed drawing correction filed on		oved by the Examiner.	
If approved, corrected drawings are required in rep			
12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Exa	aminer.		
Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120			
13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign	priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a	ı)-(d) or (f).	
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of: —			
1. Certified copies of the priority documents			
2. Certified copies of the priority documents	•		
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International But * See the attached detailed Office action for a list 	reau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	_	
14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic	c priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).	ı
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language pro 15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domesti	• •		
Attachment(s)			
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	5) Notice of Informal	y (PTO-413) Paper No(s) Patent Application (PTO-152)	
S. Datent and Trademark Office			

Art Unit: 3761

Continued Prosecution Application

The request filed on 07-02-03 for a Continued Prosecution Application (CPA) under 37 CFR 1.53(d) based on parent Application No. 09/435,562 is acceptable and a CPA has been established. An action on the CPA follows.

Interference

Claims 110-128 of this application has been copied from U.S. Patent No. 6,551,303, presumably for the purpose of provoking an interference.

Applicant has failed to specifically apply each limitation or element of each of the copied claim(s) to the disclosure of the application.

Applicant is given ONE MONTH or THIRTY DAYS, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication to specifically apply each limitation or element of each of the copied claim(s) to the disclosure of the application. See 37 CFR 1.607(a)(5). THE PROVISIONS OF 37 CFR 1.136 DO NOT APPLY TO THE TIME SPECIFIED IN THIS ACTION.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 112,117,119,120 and 128 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to

Art Unit: 3761

reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

The original specification does not provide support for the method of claim 110, further including the step of extending a stent between the membrane and the prongs to engage the ostium for securing the membrane to the ostium; the method of claim 110 further including the step of injecting a blood coagulating substance into the appendage; or securing a membrane in place by the membrane lodging against the opening and including prongs adjacent an edge extending outwardly.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 38,59,60,78 and 79 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claim 38, there is no antecedent basis for "the hollow body structure".

In claim 59, there is no antecedent basis for "the tissue attachment structure".

In claims 78 and 79, there is no antecedent basis for "the supports".

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

⁽b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Art Unit: 3761

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 110-128 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being clearly anticipated by Van Tassel, et al.-6551303.

Claims 101,107 and 108 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Huebsch, et al.-5853422.

Huebsch discloses a device having proximal and distal hubs 14,16, struts or supports 22 having apexes 24; the supports are made out of composites, stainless steel, shape memory metals or alloys, nitinol. The device may be solid, braided or woven. The entire closure device can be covered by a fabric which allows tissue ingrowth. See col. 3 line 49 –col. 4 line 9; col. 7 lines 44-55.

Claim 101 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Mobin-Uddin-3540431.

Mobin-Uddin discloses a device having six elgiloy spokes and a canopy filter made out of a porous material. The spokes open up to an inclined position when expelled from the delivery catheter 44.

Claim 119 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by King, et al.-3874388.

King discloses a device having 6 radial spoke supports and a Dacron or Teflon mesh attached to the supports. The ends of the supports have tines 93 for attachment to tissue. The umbrella device is advanced out of a catheter 1 through an ostium, pulled

Art Unit: 3761

back until the tines engage tissue on one side of an opening and the mesh then covers the opening.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

- 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
- 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
- 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
- 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Art Unit: 3761

Claims 102-105 and 109 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Huebsch, et al.-422 in view of Lentz, et al.-5961545.

Huebsch discloses the invention as claimed with the exception of the e-PTFE and the pore sizes. Lentz discloses that it was known that e-PTFE has a microporous structure which allows natural tissue ingrowth and cell endothelialization-see col. 1 lines 37-47. It would have been obvious to have made the fabric covering of Huebsch out of e-PTFE instead of those specifically disclosed, which includes PTFE, as Lentz clearly discloses that e-PTFE also has the capability of allowing for cellular ingrowth which is desirable by Huebsch-note col. 7 lines 47-49.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 51-58,61-77 and 80-98 are allowed.

Claim 106 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claim 38 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, set forth in this Office action.

Claims 39-45,59,60,78,79,would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, set forth in this Office action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 07-02-03 have been fully considered but are deemed moot in view of the new grounds of rejection.

Art Unit: 3761

Information Disclosure Statement

The file indicates that an IDS was received on 07-02-03. However, the copy of

the IDS is missing and no additional references appear to be in the file. The applicant is

requested to re-submit the previous IDS with copies of any foreign references cited with

the next response.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Glenn K Dawson whose telephone number is 703-308-

4304. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th 7:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Weilun Lo can be reached on 703-308-1957. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or

proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-

0858.

Glenn K Dawson Primary Examiner Page 7

Art Unit 3761

Gkd

03 September 2003